

GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
ABSTRACT

Public Services – Roads and Buildings – “Construction of ROB at Rayavaram Village in lieu of L.C.No.236 at Railway Km.143/10-12 of Guntur-Nandyal Section and R&B Road at K.M.37.2 of Podili-Markapur Road in Prakasam District” – Deficiency in reinforcement of deck slabs of 10.37 m effective span – Enquiry conducted – Certain R&B Officers placed under suspension – Reinstated into service - Orders - Issued.

TRANSPORT, ROADS & BUILDINGS (VIG.I.1) DEPARTMENT

G.O.Rt.No. 1082

Dated:27-11-2010
Read the following:

1. From the I/c ENC (R&B), Admn, AP, Hyderabad, Lr. No. 284/ VC(6)/2010, dated 08.03.2010.
2. From the I/c ENC (R&B), Admn, Hyderabad, D.O.Lr. No. 284/VC(6)2010, dt.20.03.2010.
3. G.O.Rt.No.298, T,R&B (Vig.I) Dept., dt.26.03.2010.
4. G.O.Rt.No.299, T,R&B (Vig.I) Dept., dt.26.03.2010.
5. G.O.Rt.No.300, T,R&B (Vig.I) Dept., dt.26.03.2010.
6. G.O.Rt.No.301, T,R&B (Vig.I) Dept., dt.26.03.2010.
7. G.O.Rt.No.302, T,R&B (Vig.I) Dept., dt.26.03.2010.
8. From the C.E., QC & Member, COT, Lr.No.63/CEQC/AE1/2010, dt.17.03.2010.
9. From Sri K.Mahender, I/c.SE, R&B Circle, Ongole (u/s.) representation, dt.14.05.2010.
10. From Sri T.Abbanna, I/c.EE, R&B Divn., Markapur, representation, dt.14.05.2010.
11. From the I/c ENC (R&B), Admn, AP, Hyderabad, Lr.No. 284/VC(6)/2010, dated 08.06.2010.

O R D E R:-

Based on the reports received from the Engineer-in-Chief (R&B), Administration in the references 1st and 2nd read above, Sri K. Mahender, I/c.SE (R&B), Ongole, Sri T.Abbanna, EE (R&B), Markapur, Sri K.Anil Kumar, Dy.EE (R&B), Kanigiri, Sri G.Nageswara Rao, DEE (R&B), Markapur and Sri A.Venugopal, AEE (R&B), Section, Markapur were kept under suspension in the references 3rd to 7th read above.

2) The Engineer-in-Chief (R&B), Administration in the reference 11th read above, has stated that the Charged Officers have submitted that the design and drawing were approved by the MORTH. The ENC (R&B), Administration ordered for the adoption of the MORTH drawing. The drawing contained a small technical defect in the reinforcement schedule for the work. The entire trouble was the result of an error in the drawing. Instead of indicating “a 2 and a 3 bars” it was written as “a 2 or a 3 bars”. The error has gone unnoticed till it was pointed out by the Quality Control Officials. The above codal rules have specified the functionaries who are responsible for designs. In the present work, they have stated that they have no role in the structural design of the approaches of the

P.T.O

ROB and they have not done anything unwarranted requiring their suspension. Further, they have stated that the bridge was got tested by Civil Aid Techno Clinic Private Limited, Hyderabad from 10.04.2010 to 14.04.2010, the agency conducted load test on one identified span of deck slab of the bridge in accordance with the stipulations made in IRC:6-2000 and IRC SP-51:Guideliens for load testing of bridges, 1972. The agency inferred that the behavior of the identified tested deck slab of the bridge was found to be good under desired loading conditions namely class 70 R as per IRC:6-2000. In the circumstances, bridge can be considered structurally safe as the deflection was 2.09 mm against 5.33 mm at the time of maximum superimposed load of the deck slab, which is very much within allowable limits and the maximum deflection value of 6.9 mm obtained from the theoretical analysis. The deflection recovery of the deck slab was found to be more than the minimum percentage recovery of deflection at 24 hours after removal of test load. He has recommended that all the Officers who are suspended in this case may be reinstated into service without prejudice to the disciplinary proceedings already initiated/contemplated.

3) The Government has observed that there are no financial irregularities or misuse of funds. But the Accused Officials are undoubtedly guilty of casual approach, slack supervision and inadequate concern for public safety. They should be subjected to disciplinary action. However, the Engineer-in-Chief's report indicated that structure is safe and other deviations are within acceptable limits. He also attributed the problems to as error in the drawings.

4) Government, after careful examination of the entire matter, decided to reinstate them into service. Accordingly, Government hereby order to reinstate Sri K.Mahender, I/c.SE (R&B), Ongole, Sri T. Abbanna, EE (R&B), Markapur, Sri K.Anil Kumar, Dy.EE (R&B), Kanigiri, and Sri A. Venugopal, AEE (R&B), Section, Markapur into service with immediate without prejudice to the disciplinary action against them.

5) The Engineer-in-Chief (R&B) Administration shall take necessary further action in the matter.

(BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANDHRA PRADESH)

S.P.SINGH.
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

To
The Individuals
(Through The Engineer-in-Chief (R&B), Administration, Hyderabad.)
The Engineer-in-Chief (R&B), Administration, Hyderabad.

Copy to
The TR&B (Services.I) Department.
SC/SF.

//FORWARDED::BY ORDER//

SECTION OFFICER